DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 392 AC 010 580

AUTHOR	Dutton, Bonnie; Easter, Luke
TITLE	The Formulation, Implementation and Evaluation of Adult Education Institutes in Tennessee, 1971.
INSTITUTION	Memphis State Univ., Tenn.
SPONS AGENCY	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.; Tennessee State Dept. of Education, Nashville.; Tennessee Univ., Knoxville.
PUB DATE	Sep 71
NOTE	54p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education, *Evaluation Techniques, Guidance Counseling, *Inservice Teacher Education, *Institutes (Training Programs), Instructional Materials, *Program Evaluation, Reading Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	Tennessee

ABSTRACT

As a result of suggestions made in approximately 10 regional inservice workshops conducted in the State of Tennessee for Adult Basic Education (ABE) personnel, three institutes were conducted to instruct participants in guidance and counseling, instructional materials, and reading. Each institute was designed as a Teacher Training Institute, and each was evaluated using a standard evaluation form to measure its overall effectiveness. Two instruments were used to collect data: a questionnaire designed to obtain demographic data and participant reaction; and an evaluation scale developed by Russell Kropp and Coolie Verner. The instruments were administered the last day of each of the three two-week institutes. Only arithmetical means and percentages were employed to analyze the data. The evaluation results show that the three ABE institutes were extremely successful. Participants felt that additional institutes should be held to cover subjects of guidance and counseling (including recruitment and retention), reading, materials, curriculum development, adult learning centers (including programmed instruction), and adult psychology. An appendix presents samples of the evaluation forms. (DB)

ED053392

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE FORMULATION, IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF ADULT EDUCATION INSTITUTES IN TENNESSEE 1971

By

Donnie Dutton
Professor and Director
Adult Education
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee

and

Luke Easter
Supervisor of Adult Education
Middle Tennessee
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Sponsored By

Memphis State University
Southern Regional Education Board
Tennessee State Department of Education
Tennessee State University
Title I of the Higher Education Act
University of Tennessee

Published September, 1971
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee

AC010580

ED053392

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Mr. Charles Kerr, Coordinator of Adult Education, State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee, for his guidance and support, without which this study could not have been completed.

To Mr. Charles Bates, Dr. James Farrell, Mr. Charles Holt, and Dr. John Peters, a special vote of thanks is offered for their assistance in data collection and for other information furnished that was included in this document.

Appreciation is expressed to Memphis State University, Southern Regional Education Board, Tennessee State Department of Education, Tennessee State University, Title I of the Higher Education Act, and the University of Tennessee for financing the ABE Institutes.

Finally, the authors are indeed grateful to Mrs. Linda Balentine, Adult Education Stenographer, Memphis State University, for the typing of the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. ii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

Objectives
Methodology
Hypotheses

II. GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING 6

Introduction
Learning Experiences and Staff
Participants
Evaluation

III. MATERIALS. 17

Introduction
Learning Experiences and Staff
Participants
Evaluation

IV. READING 27

Introduction
Learning Experiences and Staff
Participants
Evaluation

V. COMBINED EVALUATION OF INSTITUTES. 38

Profile of Participants
Physical Facilities
Objectives
Program
Overall Rating

VI. SUMMARY AND SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION 42

Summary
Supplementary Information

Appendix

SAMPLE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT 46

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Adult education is predicated on the fundamental belief that each individual is a person of worth and dignity and is entitled to develop to his maximum capabilities. This statement is indicative of the philosophy underlying the public school adult education program in Tennessee. Consequently, the improvement of school administrators, supervisors, teachers, and related personnel in adult education is most essential if the educationally disadvantaged people in Tennessee (approximately 666,000 with less than an eighth grade education) are to overcome their educational deficiencies, thus enabling them to contribute more effectively to the welfare of their homes, communities, state, and nation. The understanding of these people and their problems and a concern for their welfare and community should be paramount in the selection, training, and procurement of capable personnel. This can only be accomplished through an adequate staff development plan, with cooperative action between the State Department of Education, local school systems, and institutions of higher learning.

To facilitate the accomplishment of providing competent public school adult educators in Tennessee, a Staff Development Committee was appointed in 1970. This Committee is composed of the State Department of Education's Adult Education Staff (five members), university adult educators (four members, including one from Memphis State University, two from Tennessee State University, and one from the University of

Tennessee), and local teachers and supervisors (six members representing the geographical regions of the State--East, Middle, and West).

During 1970-71, approximately ten regional in-service workshops were conducted across the State of Tennessee for ABE personnel. At the conclusion of each of these, the participants were asked to indicate the subject areas in which they felt they needed intensive instruction. In addition, as the four regional State supervisors performed their duties across the State, they "kept track" of the comments made by the ABE personnel they visited relative to their problem areas. As a result, many problems emerged; however, three instructional areas "stood out" as being of utmost concern. These were guidance and counseling, instructional materials, and reading. Based on this information, the Staff Development Committee recommended that the State Coordinator of Adult Education, Mr. Charles Kerr, pursue the idea of providing intensive instruction in these three areas.

As a result of long and careful consideration, the ultimate plan which developed resulted in the following accomplishments:

1. Three, two-week institutes were conducted in Tennessee for ABE personnel.

2. The three institutes were held on University campuses and resulted in graduate credit.

3. An ABE Guidance and Counseling Institute was conducted at Tennessee State University, June 14-25, 1971; an ABE Materials Institute was conducted at Memphis State University, July 5-16, 1971; and an ABE Reading Institute was conducted at the University of Tennessee, July 19-30, 1971.

4. Each Institute served thirty participants--ten each from East, Middle, and West Tennessee.

5. Each Institute was designed as a Teacher Training Institute, i.e., the participants were trained to be able to assist with local in-service training across the State during 1971-72; hence, the entire State will benefit from the instruction provided in the three Institutes.

6. Each Institute utilized small group discussion sessions consistently to insure participant understanding and input.

7. Each Institute was evaluated using a standard evaluation form that attempted to measure its overall effectiveness.

EVALUATION DESIGN

Objectives

The overall objectives of each Institute will be listed in another section of this document. How well each person succeeded in achieving each objective was determined by the Institute Directors (university personnel), as they were responsible for making this assessment and assigning a grade to each person since the Institutes were offered for academic credit. No additional measure was taken in this regard. However, it was felt that there were other aspects of formulating and implementing an Institute that should be assessed. Therefore, the primary objective of this evaluation was to determine the overall effectiveness of the three Institutes, excluding gain in knowledge.

Methodology

Source of Data

The population used in this evaluative study was the participants attending the three Institutes. The responsibility for recruitment was

assigned to the State Department of Education. Data were gathered on eighty-seven persons.

Collection of Data

Two instruments were used to collect the data. The first was a questionnaire designed to obtain demographic data and participant reaction to various facets of the Institutes.

The second instrument was an evaluation scale developed by Russell Kropp and Coolie Verner.[1] According to its authors, it appears to be a valid instrument for obtaining overall participant reaction to a short-term workshop or conference. The scale consists of twenty items arranged in rank order of value, with item number one being the best thing that could be checked, item number two, the second best, and so on, with item number twenty, the least favorable response.

The instruments were administered the last day of each of the two-week Institutes. In order to encourage absolute frankness, the participants were instructed not to place their name or any other identifying marks on the instruments.

Statistical Technique

It was not the intent of the writers to make any generalizations to a broader population; therefore, no inferential statistics were used. Only arithmetical means and percentages were employed.

---

[1]Russell Kropp and Coolie Verner, "An Attitude Scale Technique for Evaluating Meetings," Adult Education, Volume VII, No. 4 (Summer, 1957), pp. 212-215.

Hypotheses

In the absence of any attempt to generalize to a broader population and the deletion of any statistical technique designed to test significant differences between variables, no hypotheses were formulated.

SUMMARY

Each of the Institutes will now be discussed in some detail in order of implementation. This discussion will include such items as administrative responsibility, subject matter covered, instructional personnel, participants attending, and evaluation.

CHAPTER II

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

An ABE Guidance and Counseling Institute was conducted at Tennessee State University, June 14-25, 1971. It was under the direct supervision of Dr. James Farrell, Director, Extension and Continuing Education, Tennessee State University, and Mr. Luke Easter and Mr. Charles Holt, Middle Tennessee Supervisors of Adult Education, Tennessee State Department of Education.[2] Most of the following information relative to the Guidance and Counseling Institute, except for the evaluative phase, was taken from the syllabus developed for the participants attending the Institute.

Introduction

The rapid growth of adult education in the last twenty years has created the need for adequate counseling services for the participants. The importance of guidance and counseling for adult students is a well accepted fact among adult educators working in all types of agencies and instituttions. However, just recognizing the need for and importance of adult counseling services has not been enough to meet the challenge of providing millions of adult students with the proper kinds of guidance.

---

[2]All of the Institutes were conducted under the supervision of Mr. Charles Kerr, Coordinator of Adult Education, State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee, and his assistance is hereby acknowledged.

The development of strong counseling services for adults has been complicated by the lack of special training for counselors of adult students. Special programs exist in most universities to train elementary, secondary, and college level counselors. Few, if any, training programs are currently operating with the purpose of preparing counselors in adult education. In fact, a review of college bulletins has failed to come up with one university in the United States which offers a course in counseling adult students.

The purpose of this workshop is to deal with some counseling needs of adult students. The following seems to be some of the most prevalent problems confronting the adult learner:

1. Lack of confidence in themselves in the educational setting is a problem for many adults. "Am I too old to learn?" is one of the most common questions asked by returning adult students. They may have read an article in a popular magazine stressing the deterioration of mental processes and assumed their learning days were nearly over once they reached the age of thirty-five. In addition, if their earlier learning experiences were marked by frustration or failure, extreme caution must be taken to assure the individual that the academic atmosphere does not contain the threats he so clearly remembers from his earlier years.

2. Long range goals take on special significance for adult students. Because of his experience in the world of work, he has recognized the dangers of terminal positions and tries to avoid dead end streets.

3. Budgeting time can be a unique problem for adult learners. With his host of responsibilities ranging from work to family and to school, problems are created in determining how to split his time. There is a lack of time for reading, preparing papers, and studying compared with his day school counterpart.

4. Family life can be a problem to students at any level of education, but it has unique implications in adult education. If the adult learner faces resistance from home, his efforts to overcome the block may be extremely frustrating and need the aid of a perceptive counselor.

5. The adult student is usually employed. As a wage earner and contributing member of society, he is obviously concerned with keeping his employment and progressing in his career while studying. If his employer is threatened by the student's attempt at improving himself or too rigid to allow him to leave work a few minutes early to attend class, problems emerge and may require the assistance of a counselor.

6. Memories are sometimes dangerous. The school room can mean punishment and failure to someone who remembers it in that way. A counselor or teacher in the adult learning situation often has the responsibility to aid a student in overcoming a negatively based memory. Admitting failure and returning to the academic world requires strength which should be aided by the professionals in the school setting.

If the needs as stated here are met, it appears that the following general objectives should serve as a point of departure:

1. To assist adults in planning programs that will enable them to capitalize on their interests, strengths, and weaknesses as they pursue their educational and/or vocational goals.

2. To provide the individual assistance in planning an educational program based on his capacity, interests, and potential designed to help acquire the competencies and skills that will assist him in seeking solutions to personal and community problems.

3. To provide a setting in which the individual seeking assistance is able to develop sufficient insight and self-understanding so that he can make his own decisions and select procedures that will lead to solution of his problem in a personally satisfying and socially acceptable manner.

Learning Experiences and Staff

To achieve the aforementioned objectives, learning experiences were designed in the areas of recruitment and retention, public relations, diagnosis, program evaluation, placement, and other component parts of the guidance and counseling process.

In addition to Farrell, Easter, and Holt, the following persons were utilized in the instructional process:

1. Mr. Morris Busby
   Memphis City Schools
   Memphis, Tennessee

2. Mrs. Pauline Cleaver
   Emily Griffith School
   Denver, Colorado

3. Mr. Royce Parman, Supervisor
   State Testing Bureau
   University of Tennessee
   Knoxville, Tennessee

4. Dr. Theodore Pinnock
   Tuskegee Institute
   Tuskegee, Alabama

5. Dr. Harold Rose, Chairman
   Department of Adult
   and Continuing Education
   Morehead State University
   Morehead, Kentucky

6. Dr. Charles Sams, Supervisor
   Guidance and Counseling
   State Department of Education
   Nashville, Tennessee

7. Dr. Ron Sherron
   Virginia Commonwealth
   University
   Richmond, Virginia

8. Dr. Lorenzo Wyatt
   East Tennessee State University
   Johnson City, Tennessee

Participants

The following persons attended the ABE Guidance and Counseling Institute held at Tennessee State University:

1. Howard V. Allen
   4004 Drakes Branch Road
   Nashville, Tennessee 37218

2. Edward Brown
   4061 Graceland
   Memphis, Tennessee 38116

3. Ernest Buffington
   802 Line Street
   Chattanooga, Tennessee 37404

4. Margaret Butler
   Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37130

5. Barbara Cash
   Bridgewater Road
   Cordova, Tennessee 38018

6. Kenneth D. Clay
   4429 Baton Rouge Drive
   Hermitage, Tennessee 37076

7. Mackie L. Driver
   3501 Geneva Circle
   Nashville, Tennessee 37209

8. Patricia Dungan
   131 Shadow Lawn Drive
   Jackson, Tennessee 38301

9. James Garrett
   3719 Midland Pike
   Chattanooga, Tennessee 37411

10. Sonja Hall
    814 Shelborn Towers
    Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

11. Ann H. Haynes
4215 W. Hamilton Road
Nashville, Tennessee 37218

12. O'Neal Holly
1040 South Wellington
Memphis, Tennessee 38126

13. Harold Howard
Huntingdon, Tennessee 38344

14. Jimmie Jordan
6727 Walsh Road
Millington, Tennessee 38053

15. Lettie M. Kendall
388 A Street
Clarksville, Tennessee 37040

16. Nannie Kilgore
Tracy City, Tennessee 37387

17. Daniel Lynch
Hendron Chapel Road
Knoxville, Tennessee 37920

18. Deotha Malone
229 South Pardue Avenue
Gallatin, Tennessee 37066

19. Hazel Parker
1896 Dearing Road
Memphis, Tennessee 38117

20. Esther Sharpe
Box 462
Copper Hill, Tennessee 37317

21. Annie Shedd
Route 1, Box 144
Covan, Tennessee 37318

22. Patricia Sizemore
600 Whispering Hills Drive
Apartment H-3
Nashville, Tennessee 37211

23. Juanita Syler
Winchester, Tennessee 37398

24. James E. Thompson
434 Lynn Drive
Nashville, Tennessee 37211

25. Glenn Weatherly
Jackson Highway
Humboldt, Tennessee 38343

26. Amelia Whitaker
900 Halcyon Avenue
Nashville, Tennessee

27. Gladys Wood
4501 Plymouth Road
Knoxville, Tennessee 37914

28. Mary Yarbrough
307 N. College Street
Covington, Tennessee 38019

29. Annie Zackery
320 South Highland Avenue
Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37130

Evaluation

The purpose of this section will be to present the results of the evaluation of the Guidance and Counseling Institute item by item. No discussion will be given; interpretation is left to the reader.

It will be divided into the following sections:

1. Profile of the participants.
2. Physical facilities.
3. Objectives.
4. Program.
5. Strengths.
6. Weaknesses.
7. Overall rating.

Profile of Participants

Relative to the profile of the participants attending the Guidance and Counseling Institute, it was found that:

1. The majority were females (65.5 per cent).
2. The majority were 35 years of age or older (75.9 per cent).
3. The majority were non-white (62.1 per cent).
4. The majority possessed less than a master's degree (55.2 per cent).
5. The majority possessed more than 3 years' experience in ABE (58.6 per cent).
6. The majority possessed more than 10 years' teaching experience in the public schools other than ABE (58.6 per cent).
7. The majority of the public school experience other than ABE was in elementary education (55.2 per cent).
8. The majority were part-time employees (89.7 per cent).

Physical Facilities

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to physical facilities and the rating of each:[3]

1.	Adequate space was provided for large group meetings.	4.7
2.	Adequate space was provided for small group sessions.	4.4
3.	Accommodations for the participants were adequate.	4.1

Objectives

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to objectives and the rating of each:[4]

1.	The objectives of the Institute were relevant to the needs of the participants.	4.6
2.	The objectives of the Institute were clearly defined to the participants.	4.3
3.	The participants had an opportunity to contribute to the development of the content of the Institute.	4.0
4.	Adequate time was available for the objectives of the Institute to be realized.	4.0

---

[3]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

[4]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 3.

Program

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the program and the rating of each:[5]

1.	The content of the program was relevant to my needs.	4.6
2.	The program of the Institute was in line with the stated objectives.	4.2
3.	Adequate lines of communication were established between staff and participants.	4.3
4.	The content of the Institute was such that it answered questions that concerned me relative to my job.	4.3
5.	As a result of the Institute, I feel that I will now be better able to perform my job.	4.4

Strengths

The following strengths were listed by the participants attending the Guidance and Counseling Institute:

1. Retention and follow-up; good speakers.
2. Recruitment.
3. Individual and group participation.
4. Task group meetings and consultants.
5. Group cooperation in individual involvement; competent consultants; presence of facilitators; my group leader.

---

[5]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

6. Quality of speakers; current information and overall attitude of all involved.

7. Guided discussions.

8. Flexibility of schedule as need arose; selection of Dr. Pinnock as a speaker; association with authorities.

9. Involvement as a result of small groups.

10. Small groups, competent consultants; ever present staff.

11. Use of facilitators; good speakers; adequate time.

12. Involvement of the participants.

13. Well planned; good speakers, facilitators, and group leaders.

14. Content.

15. Total concept of ABE was covered.

16. Cooperation and rapport; serious consideration of a pertinent problem; have never seen or worked in a more relaxed and enjoyable, but serious, atmosphere.

17. Topics discussed.

18. Involvement; leaders were excellent; small groups.

19. Togetherness of administration and participants in working; best sources of information.

20. Made you conscious of your problems and then gave ways to solve them.

21. Participants worked together and shared experiences; the best consultants were secured.

22. Involvement; cooperation of the administrative staff and the cooperation of participants in working to achieve our objectives.

23. Information given by Dr. Pinnock.

24. Wealth of material from the State Department of Education.

25. Good facilitators; well planned and coordinated program.

26. Interest and enthusiasm of facilitators; knowledge and concern of speakers.

Weaknesses

The following weaknesses were listed by the participants attending the Guidance and Counseling Institute:

1. Need for learning groups in order to talk to everyone.
2. Outlines for papers would have been helpful.
3. No strong central authority to direct us.
4. Ambiguity of participants' goals; ambiguity of financial reimbursement; discussion groups did not occur.
5. Not enough time.
6. Public relations presentation.
7. Reading speaker did nothing but gather information for himself.
8. Some consultants did not hold attention of the group.
9. Failure to have speakers' topics in sequence.
10. Long hours; some administrative roles not clearly defined; need for more related material in campus library.
11. No weaknesses (five responses).
12. Too much wasted time in total group sessions.
13. Refreshments not provided.
14. Developing a paper without guidelines.
15. More time needed.
16. Too many topics in a short time.
17. Too many jokes; learning groups would have been helpful; time wasted with facilitators reacting to speakers.
18. Too much theory; not enough role playing.
19. Time; reverse week for speakers.
20. No continuity.

Overall Rating

Two measures were taken in an attempt to measure the overall value ascribed to the Guidance and Counseling Institute. The first of these was the participants' reaction to the statement: My overall rating for the Institute is very high, high, medium, low, or very low. The value given to this item was 4.3 out of a maximum possible of five.[6]

The second assessment taken was the participants' reaction to the Institute as measured by the Kropp-Verner Scale. The ratings of the participants were analyzed, and the obtained weighted mean, according to values on the Kropp-Verner Scale, was 3.16. The most positive score possible is 1.13, and the most negative value is 10.89. A mean rating of 3.16 placed the overall rating of the Institute between items four and five on the scale, which means that there were sixteen less favorable items below the mean rating but only four more favorable ones above.

---

[6]The rating was based on the following scale:

5=Very high
4=High
3=Medium
2=Low
1=Very low

CHAPTER III

MATERIALS

An ABE Materials Institute was conducted at Memphis State University, July 5-16, 1971. It was under the direct supervision of Dr. Donnie Dutton, Professor and Director, Adult Education, Memphis State University, and Mr. Billy Glover, West Tennessee Supervisor of Adult Education, Tennessee State Department of Education. Most of the following information relative to the Materials Institute, except for the evaluation, was taken from the syllabus developed for the participants attending the Institute.

Introduction

Adult basic education teachers are faced with the challenging task of helping adults improve their life style by assisting them in the development of previously undeveloped educational skills. In order to perform this service, ABE teachers must be competent in the selection and use of instructional materials. Therefore, the objectives of the Institute were for the participants to develop the ability to:

1. Evaluate commercial instructional materials based upon recognized accepted principles of material evaluation.
2. Develop materials suitable for use in local ABE classrooms.
3. Use commercial newspapers in the various instructional areas--reading, language arts, math, social studies, etc.
4. Assist in the conducting of similar local workshops whenever scheduled for their geographic area.

Learning Experiences and Staff

To achieve the aforementioned objectives, learning experiences were provided in the areas of evaluating commercial materials, developing local materials, using the newspaper in ABE classes, and designing local materials workshops.

In addition to Dutton and Clover, the following persons were utilized in the instructional process:

1. Mrs. Sophia Brotherton
   Assistant Professor of Education
   Memphis State University
   Memphis, Tennessee

2. Mrs. Carol Geeslin, Consultant
   Educational Consultants Corp.
   Thomasville, Georgia

3. Dr. Robert Geeslin, Director
   Educational Consultants Corp.
   Thomasville, Georgia

4. Dr. Jan Higgins
   Assistant Professor of
   Secondary Education
   Memphis State University
   Memphis, Tennessee

5. Mr. David Hill
   Assistant Professor of Education
   Memphis State University
   Memphis, Tennessee

6. Mrs. Hazel Parker, Supervisor
   Adult Learning Centers
   Memphis City Schools
   Memphis, Tennessee

7. Mr. Tom Rakes, Instructor
   Reading Center
   University of Tennessee
   Knoxville, Tennessee

8. Mr. Eugene Rutland, Director
   Educational Services
   The Commercial Appeal
   495 Union Avenue
   Memphis, Tennessee

9. Dr. Paul Sisco, Chairman
   Department of Geography
   Memphis State University
   Memphis, Tennessee

10. Mrs. Patsy Stidman
    ABE Teacher
    Memphis City Schools
    Memphis, Tennessee

11. Mr. Blake Welch
    Director of Adult Education
    Memphis City-Shelby County
    Schools
    Memphis, Tennessee

12. Mrs. Ann Wood
    Area Consultant
    Elementary Education
    Memphis City Schools
    Memphis, Tennessee

Participants

The following persons attended the ABE Materials Institute conducted at Memphis State University:

1. Archer P. Bardos
   504 W. Meadecrest Drive
   Knoxville, Tennessee 37919

2. Milton J. Brinkley
   1656 Foster Avenue
   Memphis, Tennessee 38106

3. Alvin Brown
   Route 4 Box 122
   Somerville, Tennessee 38068

4. Bob L. Colston
   Route 2
   Whitwell, Tennessee 37397

5. Mackie L. Driver
   3501 Geneva Circle
   Nashville, Tennessee 37209

6. Joan S. Ford
   528 Vance Drive
   Bristol, Tennessee 37620

7. General A. Freed
   266 Hollywood Blvd.
   Gallatin, Tennessee 37066

8. Edwin B. Garrett
   117 Myers Street
   Livingston, Tennessee 38570

9. Thrift Green
   1293 Quinn Avenue
   Memphis, Tennessee 38106

10. Waynne B. James
    2521 Kingston Pike #1409
    Knoxville, Tennessee 37919

11. Daisy R. Jarrell
    1525 Elliston
    Memphis, Tennessee 38106

12. Roe L. Jaynes
    940 Cooper Street
    Kingsport, Tennessee 37665

13. Linda Ledford
    652 Scenic Drive
    Lewisburg, Tennessee 37091

14. Lee Frank Lowery
    801 N. Hays Avenue
    Jackson, Tennessee

15. Carolyn Middleton Bynum
    4250 Rhodes
    Memphis, Tennessee 38111

16. Leon Richard Nelson
    165 Lone Oak Cove
    Memphis, Tennessee 38109

17. James Porter
    P. O. Box 34
    Mason, Tennessee 38049

18. Kenneth Ralston
    Route 1 Box 44
    Savannah, Tennessee 38372

19. Georgia Robinson
    Box 253
    Briceville, Tennessee 37710

20. Arnold Irwin Smith
    6652 Beacon Lane
    Nashville, Tennessee 37209

21. Spurgeon J. Smith
    P. O. Box 292
    Henning, Tennessee 38041

22. Eleanor Smotherman
    1005 N. Main Street
    Carthage, Tennessee 37030

23. Katherine Starling
302 Gillespie Rd.
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37411

24. Harriet Villines
527 Pawnee Dr.
Springfield, Tennessee 37172

25. Anna R. Webb
163 Sixth Ave. N.
Huntingdon, Tennessee 38344

26. C. Blake Welch
3867 Springfield Dr.
Memphis, Tennessee 38128

27. Elaine Wilson
Route 1
Chapel Hill, Tennessee 37034

28. James E. Wright
595 Joyce Lane
Nashville, Tennessee 37216

Evaluation

The purpose of this section will be to present the results of the evaluation of the Materials Institute item by item. No discussion will be given; interpretation is left to the reader. It will be divided into the following sections:

1. Profile of the participants.
2. Physical facilities.
3. Objectives.
4. Program.
5. Strengths.
6. Weaknesses.
7. Overall rating.

Profile of Participants

Relative to the profile of the participants attending the Materials Institute, it was found that:

1. The majority were males (53.6 per cent).
2. The majority were 35 years of age or older (71.4 per cent).
3. The majority were white (60.7 per cent).

4. The majority possessed less than a master's degree (71.4 per cent).

5. The majority possessed more than 3 years' experience in ABE (60.7 per cent).

6. The majority possessed more than 10 years' teaching experience in the public schools other than ABE (67.9 per cent).

7. The majority of the public school experience other than ABE was in elementary education (67.9 per cent).

8. The majority were part-time employees (82.1 per cent).

Physical Facilities

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to physical facilities available at the Materials Institute and the rating of each:[7]

1. Adequate space was provided for large group meetings.	4.4
2. Adequate space was provided for small group sessions.	4.3
3. Accommodations for the participants were adequate.	4.4

Objectives

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the objectives of the Materials Institute and the rating of each:[8]

1. The objectives of the Institute were relevant to the needs of the participants.	4.6

---

[7]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

[8]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 7.

2. The objectives of the Institute were clearly defined to the participants.	4.6
3. The participants had an opportunity to contribute to the development of the content of the Institute.	4.6
4. Adequate time was available for the objectives of the Institute to be realized.	4.2

Program

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the program at the Materials Institute and the rating of each:[9]

1. The content of the program was relevant to my needs.	4.7
2. The program of the Institute was in line with the stated objectives.	4.3
3. Adequate lines of communication were established between staff and participants.	4.8
4. The content of the Institute was such that it answered questions that concerned me relative to my job.	4.3
5. As a result of the Institute, I feel that I will now be better able to perform my job.	4.6

---

[9]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

Strengths

The following strengths were listed by the participants attending the Materials Institute:

1. It will help in use of the newspaper.
2. It was very well centered around information that will benefit ABE teachers in their working areas.
3. Most of the speakers and materials were relevant to the ABE program.
4. Specialists were provided in all areas.
5. Rapport was good.
6. Director's advising and planning.
7. The workshop was well organized and relevant.
8. Objectives clearly stated and met; participants had excellent opportunity to contribute to development of content; exactly what I needed; communication very good; excellent personnel.
9. It gave us something we could use instead of just theory.
10. Rapport of the participants; administrative cooperation; the agenda; the consultants.
11. Pleasing atmosphere; plenty of opportunity for interaction.
12. The strength was the actual evaluation of materials.
13. Leadership by the Director; no pressure exerted by anyone; we knew what he expected us to do.
14. Administration by the Director.
15. Evaluation of materials; becoming acquainted with other teachers from other parts of the State.
16. Topics relevant to ABE teachers' needs; participation of participants.
17. A criteria for evaluating materials and putting it into practice; the development of these materials for practical usage.

18. Well organized; provided for group interaction; program in line with stated objectives.

19. Objectives that were extremely applicable to my needs; Bob and Carol Geeslin.

20. I have a better insight as to how beneficial the newspaper can help adults learn to read better.

21. The evaluation of ABE materials.

22. The evaluation of materials.

23. I have really enjoyed this experience. I have appreciated every effort put forth by the Director, the University, our Supervisors, and the people who live here in Memphis who were in our workshop. I think the Director did a beautiful job; the Institute was well organized and managed; the areas of study were timely; I was pleased with the time spent on the newspaper.

24. The organization for evaluation of materials; presenting programmed materials.

25. Statement of objectives and adhering to them; the administrative procedures were excellent.

26. Organization; objectives; participants' opportunity to contribute to the program.

27. The organizational set-up; the Director was one of the best; each participant was treated with royalty.

28. Content relevant to my needs; most relaxed atmosphere between staff and participants I have seen; organization; David Hill; Mrs. Brotherton; Geeslins.

Weaknesses

The following weaknesses were listed by the participants attending the Materials Institute:

1. Should have three weeks instead of two.

2. None.

3. None.

4. None.

5. Some speakers were weak. Need more study in consumer education.

6. Consumer education was weak.

7. None.

8. More information should be covered on Level I.

9. Too much time on the newspaper.

10. None.

11. Not teaching relevant materials for adults. Second week was more geared for children.

12. Assignment to perform an activity in depth when a model would have revealed one's understanding of the task.

13. Too much time on the newspaper.

14. Consumer education.

15. Consumer education.

16. Some speakers; Geography is a subject we use less in ABE.

17. Too much emphasis on the newspaper as a material in contrast to other available materials.

18. Consumer education.

19. Delay in delivery of materials.

20. The chairs were not very comfortable; the room was stuffy at times.

21. Too much lecture the second week. Not enough time with Carol Geeslin on the materials kit.

22. Lack of time.

23. None.

24. Lectures too long.

25. Some consultants were weak.

26. Not enough time allotted for various areas.

27. None.

28. None.

Overall Rating

Two measures were taken in an attempt to measure the overall value ascribed to the Materials Institute. The first of these was the participants' reaction to the statement: My overall rating for the Institute is very high, high, medium, low, or very low. The value given to this item was 4.7 out of a maximum possible of five.[10]

The second assessment taken was the participants' reaction to the Institute as measured by the Kropp-Verner Scale. The ratings of the participants were analyzed, and the obtained weighted mean, according to values on the Kropp-Verner Scale, was 3.04. The most positive score possible is 1.13, and the most negative value is 10.89. A mean rating of 3.04 placed the overall rating of the Institute between items four and five on the scale, which means that there were sixteen less favorable items below the mean rating but only four more favorable ones above.

---

[10]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Very high
4=High
3=Medium
2=Low
1=Very low

CHAPTER IV

READING

The University of Tennessee conducted an ABE Reading Institute July 19-30, 1971. It was under the direct supervision of Dr. John Peters, Associate Professor, Continuing and Higher Education, University of Tennessee, and Mr. Charles Bates, East Tennessee Supervisor of Adult Education, Tennessee State Department of Education. Most of the following information relative to the Reading Institute, except for the evaluation, was taken from the syllabus developed for the participants attending the Institute.

Introduction

Adult basic education teachers are faced with the responsibility of teaching adults who lack sufficient reading skills to cope with society's demands. Reading is not only a singular topic meriting attention as a subject to be taught in ABE, but it is also related to other subject areas within the ABE curriculum. If reading lies at the heart of the total ABE curriculum, it stands to reason that its principles and methodology should be mastered by ABE teachers and related to the mastery of all other curriculum content areas.

A large number of ABE teachers are experienced in teaching reading and have succeeded in teaching children to read. However, few have received sufficient training in teaching reading to adults. Moreover, most have not received refresher training for skills earlier developed in

their professional education. Finally, little emphasis has been placed on integrating the teaching of reading with other subject matter to be taught in the ABE curriculum. It is for these reasons that the overall objectives of the University of Tennessee ABE Institute were for the thirty participants to:

1. Increase their understanding of the subject of reading as related to word attack and comprehension skills.
2. Develop skill in diagnosing reading difficulties and placing students in reading programs.
3. Increase their competency in the selection and evaluation of reading materials.
4. Develop their ability to incorporate reading skills into other curriculum areas in ABE.

Learning Experiences and Staff

To achieve the aforementioned objectives, learning experiences were provided in the various areas of teaching reading--word attack, comprehension, selection and use of materials, and diagnosis of readability level.

In addition to Peters and Bates, the following persons were utilized in the instructional process:

1. Dr. Leonard Breen
   Director of Reading Center
   University of Tennessee
   Knoxville, Tennessee
2. Mr. Charles Cummings, Supervisor
   Adult Evening High School
   Division of Adult Education
   Memphis City Schools
   Memphis, Tennessee
3. Mr. Jere Farley
   Educational Relations Specialist
   Tennessee Valley Authority
   Knoxville, Tennessee
4. Mrs. Flora Fowler
   Reading Specialist
   East Tennessee State University
   Johnson City, Tennessee

5. Mr. William Garrison
Acorn Incorporated
Nashville, Tennessee

6. Mrs. Johnnie Littlefield
ABE Supervisor
Lenoir City Schools
Lenoir City, Tennessee

7. Mrs. Bentley Marane
ABE Teacher
Chattanooga, Tennessee

8. Mr. Tom Rakes
Reading Center
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Participants

The following persons attended the ABE Reading Institute at the University of Tennessee:

1. Jim Agee
Route 2
Jacksboro, Tennessee 37757

2. Constance Anthony
219 Benedict
Oak Ridge, Tennessee

3. Ray Baker
1007 Draughan Avenue
Nashville, Tennessee 37204

4. Carole Brownlee
3637 White Birch
Memphis, Tennessee 38106

5. Mike Cain
Selmer, Tennessee

6. Pat Coffee
5133 Kittie Lee Lane
Memphis, Tennessee 38118

7. Bob Colston
Victoria, Tennessee 37373

8. William Cotrell, Jr.
Western State Hospital
Bolivar, Tennessee

9. Charles Cummings
2597 Avery
Memphis, Tennessee 38112

10. Bobby Davis
P. O. Box 39
Lenoir City, Tennessee 37771

11. Pauline Davis
5107 Inskip Road
Knoxville, Tennessee

12. Walter Gibson
5015 Ravensworth
Memphis, Tennessee 38106

13. Howell Hipsher
500 Windsor Drive
Sparta, Tennessee 38583

14. Shirley Hubbard
1133 Starline
Memphis, Tennessee 38109

15. Tom Kaylor
Route 1, Airport Road
Morristown, Tennessee 37814

16. Anna Ligon
P. O. Box 435
Gallatin, Tennessee

17. Johnnie Littlefield
501 W. Third Avenue
Lenoir City, Tennessee

18. Ethelene Lujan
Box 82
Cowan, Tennessee 37318

19. Bentley Marane
1017 Old Mill Lane
Hixson, Tennessee 37343

20. Louise McGhee
1212 Moses Street
Knoxville, Tennessee

21. Sally J. Moore
26 Current Street
Clarksville, Tennessee 37040

22. Lonnie Purkey
Route 1
Church Hill, Tennessee 37642

23. Doug Rambo
1850 Laurel Ridge Drive
Nashville, Tennessee 37216

24. Juanita Ransom
Route 2, Box 113-6
Somerville, Tennessee

25. Doris Ray
857 Maple Drive
Memphis, Tennessee 38103

26. Margaret Sims
2509 Gardner Lane
Nashville, Tennessee 37204

27. Jim Suiter, Jr.
Route 2
Springfield, Tennessee 37172

28. Patsy Tucker
Tracy City, Tennessee 37387

29. Maurice H. Warner
5961 Woodstock-Cuba Road
Millington, Tennessee 38053

30. Louise Witt
Box 73
Etowah, Tennessee

Evaluation

The purpose of this section will be to present the results of the evaluation of the Reading Institute item by item. No discussion will be given; interpretation is left to the reader. It will be divided into the following sections:

1. Profile of the participants.
2. Physical facilities.
3. Objectives.
4. Program.
5. Strengths.

6. Weaknesses.

7. Overall rating.

Profile of the Participants

Relative to the profile of the participants attending the Reading Institute, it was found that:

1. There were as many males as females (50.0 per cent each).

2. The majority were 35 years of age or older (66.7 per cent).

3. The majority were white (63.3 per cent).

4. The majority possessed less than a master's degree (76.7 per cent).

5. The majority possessed more than 1 year's experience (80 per cent).

6. The majority possessed more than 2 years' teaching experience in the public schools other than ABE (86.7 per cent).

7. The majority of the public school experience other than ABE was in elementary education (53.3 per cent).

8. The majority were part-time employees (73.3 per cent).

Physical Facilities

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the physical facilities and the rating of each:[11]

1. Adequate space was provided for large group meetings. 4.5

---

[11]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

2. Adequate space was provided for small group sessions. 4.5

3. Accommodations for the participants were adequate. 4.2

Objectives

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to objectives and the rating of each:[12]

1. The objectives of the Institute were relevant to the needs of the participants. 4.7

2. The objectives of the Institute were clearly defined to the participants. 4.5

3. The participants had an opportunity to contribute to the development of the content of the Institute. 4.2

4. Adequate time was available for the objectives of the Institute to be realized. 4.0

Program

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the program and the rating of each:[13]

1. The content of the program was relevant to my needs. 4.5

---

[12]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

[13]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 12.

2. The program of the Institute was in line with the stated objectives.	4.5
3. Adequate lines of communication were established between staff and participants.	4.5
4. The content of the Institute was such that it answered questions that concerned me relative to my job.	4.5
5. As a result of the Institute, I feel that I will now be better able to perform my job.	4.7

Strengths

The following statements were listed by the participants attending the Reading Institute:

1. Placing of ABE students' various activities to use in teaching reading; various hardware to use in teaching reading; putting all pertinent material in a notebook.

2. Very informative, clear, and concise.

3. Organization which showed pre-planning by giving objectives the very first day; compiled notebook was terrific; content of Institute; capable speakers and staff.

4. The relaxed atmosphere and presentation of materials by an excellent staff.

5. Measurable objectives; relaxed atmosphere.

6. Participating in excursions designed to teach skills development; diagnosing and evaluating materials.

7. Fowler, Rakes, and Breen; information well organized; congeniality and interaction of students.

8. Personnel; organization; atmosphere of cooperation and congeniality.

9. Availability of resident instructors and the relaxed way the practicum sessions were conducted.

10. Establishing more specific strengths in reading techniques, words, etc.; comprehension materials for ABE.

11. Defined learning in terms of behavioral objectives, practicums in afternoon; leaders made us feel welcome and accepted.

12. Statement of objectives, then gearing the course to meet them; a chance for response and instant feedback through small group discussion sessions; enthusiastic and well informed staff.

13. Down to earth explanations, personnel conducting Institute.

14. The fine preparation by the people involved.

15. Personnel; materials.

16. Well planned; good speakers; practicums.

17. The teachers and their organization of materials.

18. The ability to learn in a relaxed situation; capable group leaders; topics covered.

19. Carrying more overall knowledge about teaching adults back home.

20. Smaller groups.

21. Staff; organization; objectives.

22. Learning about many good programs that can be used in ABE.

23. Consultants very good, small groups; materials and presentations; staff-participant relationships.

24. Using actual materials to demonstrate a point; then allowing each participant to use the materials and machines.

25. Discussing the basic things I needed to know about the way to approach adults.

26. Well organized; schedule followed and deviations were minor.

27. Pre-planning was exceptional and follow-up very high.

28. The manner in which materials were presented with everyone helping each other; the opportunity to be with experienced persons in the field.

29. Opportunity for questions on topics that needed more clarification; practicum sessions.

Weaknesses

The following weaknesses were listed by the participants attending the Reading Institute:

1. Lapse of time in getting started; poor coordination of speakers and their order of presentation; inconsistency of break periods.
2. Not quite enough help available at Level I.
3. Lack of time.
4. Participants should have been informed in advance as to how the stipends would be paid.
5. Lack of general explanation before the Institute of the purposes, content, etc. of the Institute.
6. Lack of information as to objectives, organization, etc. previous to the Institute.
7. One speaker was poor.
8. Some participants had no experience with teaching reading and attending Institutes; others had much; needs might have been better met with a more homogenous group.
9. The part dealing with materials and learning centers seemed a waste of time since most ABE teachers could never have access to one.
10. Covering material too fast.
11. None.
12. Lack of participation during presentations.
13. Lack of "pre-information" as to objectives, where to go, money to bring, etc.
14. Lack of time.
15. None.
16. Not knowing when the checks would be distributed.
17. May have covered too much.
18. Too much material covered.

19. One speaker was bad; need closer inspection and knowledge of personnel involved.

20. More sharing of ideas in some groups; too much individual work required.

21. Not being familiar with material used.

22. Could have had a cross section or variety of speakers from out-of-state.

23. Length of Institute too short.

24. More time to visit lab and center.

25. Lack of time for sharing teaching experiences.

Overall Rating

Two measures were taken in an attempt to measure the overall value ascribed to the Reading Institute. The first of these was the participants' reaction to the statement: My overall rating for the Institute is very high, high, medium, low, or very low. The value given to this item was 4.8 out of a maximum possible of five:[14]

The second assessment taken was the participants' reaction to the Institute as measured by the Kropp-Verner Scale. The ratings of the participants were analyzed, and the obtained weighted mean was 3.13. The most positive score possible is 1.13, and the most negative value is 10.89. A mean rating of 3.13 placed the overall rating of the Institute

---

[14]The rating was based on the following scale:

5=Very high
4=High
3=Medium
2=Low
1=Very low

between items four and five on the scale, which means that there were sixteen less favorable items below the mean rating but only four more favorable ones above.

CHAPTER V

COMBINED EVALUATION OF INSTITUTES

The purpose of this section will be to present the combined evaluation, item by item, of all three of the ABE Institutes--Guidance and Counseling, Materials, and Reading. It will be divided into the following sections:

1. Profile of participants.
2. Physical facilities.
3. Objectives.
4. Program.
5. Overall rating.

Profile of Participants

Relative to the profile of the participants attending the three ABE Institutes, it was found that:

1. The majority were females (54 per cent).
2. The majority were 35 years of age or older (71.3 per cent).
3. The majority were white (54 per cent).
4. The majority possessed less than a master's degree (67.3 per cent).
5. The majority possessed more than 3 years' experience in ABE (54.1 per cent).
6. The majority possessed more than 10 years' teaching experience in the public schools other than ABE (58.7 per cent).
7. The majority of the public school experience other than ABE was in elementary education (58.6 per cent).
8. The majority were part-time employees (61.6 per cent).

Physical Facilities

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to physical facilities at the three ABE Institutes and the rating of each:[15]

1.	Adequate space was provided for large group meetings.	4.5
2.	Adequate space was provided for small group sessions.	4.5
3.	Accommodations for the participants were adequate.	4.2

Objectives

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the objectives of the three ABE Institutes and the rating of each:[16]

1.	The objectives of the Institute were relevant to the needs of the participants.	4.6
2.	The objectives of the Institute were clearly defined to the participants.	4.5
3.	The participants had an opportunity to contribute to the development of the content of the Institute.	4.5
4.	Adequate time was available for the objectives of the Institute to be realized.	4.1

---

[15]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

[16]The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 15.

Program

Following is a list of the statements provided relative to the program at the three ABE Institutes and the rating of each:[17]

1.	The content of the program was relevant to my needs.	4.6
2.	The program of the Institute was in line with the stated objectives.	4.3
3.	Adequate lines of communication were established between staff and participants.	4.5
4.	The content of the Institute was such that it answered questions that concerned me relative to my job.	4.4
5.	As a result of the Institute, I feel that I will now be better able to perform my job.	4.6

Overall Rating

Two measures were taken in an attempt to measure the overall value ascribed to the three ABE Institutes. The first of these was the participants' reaction to the statement: My overall rating for the Institute is very high, high, medium, low, or very low. The value given to this item was 4.6 out of a maximum possible of five.[18]

---

[17]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Strongly agree
4=Agree
3=Undecided
2=Disagree
1=Strongly disagree

[18]The ratings were based on the following scale:

5=Very high
4=High
3=Medium
2=Low
1=Very low

The second assessment taken was the participants' reaction to the Institutes as measured by the Kropp-Verner Scale. The ratings of the participants were analyzed, and the obtained weighted mean, according to values on the Kropp-Verner Scale, was 3.13. The most positive score possible is 1.13, and the most negative value is 10.89. A mean rating of 3.13 placed the overall rating of the Institutes between items four and five on the scale, which means that there were sixteen less favorable items below the mean rating but only four more favorable ones above.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Summary

As one peruses the various evaluation information presented in this document, it should become evident that the three ABE Institutes were a tremendous success. Out of a maximum possible of five, no item received lower than a 4.0 rating. To be sure, there were some problems, however, these were minor in nature and were offset by the many successful learning experiences that were provided.

Supplementary Information

Two other items of information were gathered on the evaluation forms that bear mentioning. One of these was whether the participants felt that additional institutes of this nature should be held in forthcoming years. The overwhelming response to this item was yes. Eighty-four of the respondents (96.2 per cent) indicated a positive answer to this question.

The second item was for those who felt that additional institutes of this type were needed to indicate subjects of concern to them that should be considered in formulating additional ones. Their responses follow:

1. Guidance and counseling (13 responses).
2. Recruitment and retention (10 responses).

3. Reading (12 responses).

4. Materials (9 responses).

5. Other content areas such as science, mathematics, consumer education, economics (9 responses). (No single subject area received more than 3 votes).

6. Curriculum development (8 responses).

7. Learning lab operation and individualized instruction (8 responses).

8. Adult psychology (5 responses).

9. Methods and techniques (4 responses).

10. Evaluation (4 responses).

11. Teaching by use of newspaper (3 responses).

12. More on Level I (3 responses).

13. Other (10 responses). (Includes motivation, student-teacher relationships, teacher professionalism, grouping, teaching those 50-59 years of age, placement, community involvement, ABE program administration, teaching deaf and blind, teaching Level II).

No single response predominated, except possibly for the area of guidance and counseling, if the topics of recruitment and retention are included. It would seem appropriate to recommend that some assessment be made of the total ABE teacher population in Tennessee this academic year (1971-72) as to their interest in certain of these topics such as:

1. Guidance and counseling, including recruitment and retention.

2. Reading.

3. Materials.

4. Curriculum development.

5. Adult learning centers, including programmed instruction.

6. Adult psychology.

These should be listed on a survey sheet with spaces left open for the addition of any extra ones. This information could be obtained at the conclusion of regional in-service sessions across the State in 1971-72. This would give the Staff Development Committee some input to guide them in future planning.

APPENDIX

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
AND
TENNESSEE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ABE MATERIALS INSTITUTE

PERSONAL DATA

1. SEX

_____Male

_____Female

2. AGE

_____Less than 35

_____35 and over

3. RACE

_____White

_____Non White

4. DEGREE PRESENTLY HELD

_____Less than Bachelor's

_____Bachelor's

_____Master's

_____Specialist

5. ACTUAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN ABE

_____Less than 1 academic year

_____1-3 academic years

_____More than 3 academic years

_____Not applicable

6. NUMBER OF YEARS EXPERIENCE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS OTHER THAN ABE

_____Less than 2 years

_____2-10 years

_____More than 10 years

7. HAS YOUR EXPERIENCE, AS LISTED IN ITEM 6, BEEN PRIMARILY IN

_____Elementary education

_____Secondary education

_____Other (Specify) _____

8. PRESENT ABE EMPLOYMENT

_____Full-time

_____Part-time

9. PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT

_____West Tennessee (Glover)

_____Middle Tennessee (Easter & Holt)

_____East Tennessee (Bates)

****

Following are some statements with which you may agree or disagree. There are no correct or incorrect answers so feel free to express your feelings. Please give us your own opinion about these items by circling the answer that best describes how you feel. Also, a blank is provided after each statement for any written comments that you may care to make.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

10. ADEQUATE SPACE WAS PROVIDED FOR LARGE GROUP MEETINGS.

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

11. ADEQUATE SPACE WAS PROVIDED FOR SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

12. THE ACCOMMODATIONS FOR THE PARTICIPANTS WERE ADEQUATE.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

OBJECTIVES

13. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE INSTITUTE WERE RELEVANT TO THE NEEDS OF THE PARTICIPANTS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

14. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE INSTITUTE WERE CLEARLY DEFINED TO THE PARTICIPANTS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

15. THE PARTICIPANTS HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONTENT OF THE INSTITUTE.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

16. ADEQUATE TIME WAS AVAILABLE FOR THE OBJECTIVES OF THE INSTITUTE TO BE REALIZED.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

PROGRAM

17. THE CONTENT OF THE INSTITUTE WAS RELEVANT TO MY NEEDS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

18. THE PROGRAM OF THE INSTITUTE WAS IN LINE WITH THE STATED OBJECTIVES OF THE INSTITUTE.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

19. ADEQUATE LINES OF COMMUNICATION WERE ESTABLISHED BETWEEN STAFF AND PARTICIPANTS.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

20. THE CONTENT OF THE INSTITUTE WAS SUCH THAT IT ANSWERED QUESTIONS THAT CONCERNED ME RELATIVE TO MY JOB.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

21. AS A RESULT OF THE INSTITUTE, I FEEL THAT I WILL NOW BE BETTER ABLE TO PERFORM MY JOB MORE SATISFACTORILY.

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comments: _____

_____

22. MY OVERALL RATING FOR THE INSTITUTE IS:

Very High High Medium Low Very Low

Comments: _____

_____

****

Please complete the following items:

23. Identify the greatest overall strengths of the Institute.

_____

_____

_____

_____

24. Identify the greatest overall weaknesses of the Institute.

_____

_____

_____

_____

25. Do you favor additional institutes of this type?

Yes_____

No_____

26. If you answered Item 25 yes, please indicate some of the topics that you feel would need to be covered.

_____

_____

KROPP-VERNER EVALUATION SCALE*

Please follow directions carefully: Read all twenty of the following statements. Check as many statements as necessary to describe your reaction to the Institute.

1. ____ It was one of the most rewarding experiences I have ever had.
2. ____ Exactly what I wanted.
3. ____ I hope we can have another one in the near future.
4. ____ It provided the kind of experience that I can apply to my own situation.
5. ____ It helped me personally.
6. ____ It solved some problems for me.
7. ____ I think it served its purpose.
8. ____ It had some merits.
9. ____ It was fair.
10. ____ It was neither very good nor very poor.
11. ____ I was mildly disappointed.
12. ____ It was not exactly what I needed.
13. ____ It was too general.
14. ____ I am not taking any new ideas away.
15. ____ It didn't hold my interest.
16. ____ It was much too superficial.
17. ____ I leave dissatisfied.
18. ____ It was very poorly planned.
19. ____ I didn't learn a thing.
20. ____ It was a complete waste of time.

*Dr. R. Kropp and Dr. C. Verner, Florida State University

(If you wish, add any comments on reverse side of this page.)

ERIC Clearinghouse
SEP 2 6 1971
on Adult Education